

## **US-UK Security Sector Reform Workshop Conference Report and Way Ahead**

Representatives from the UK (Ministry of Defense, Department for International Development, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Unit) and the United States (Departments of State, Justice, Defense and the Agency for International Development) met November 7-8 in Washington DC to discuss common approaches to Security Sector Reform (SSR). Agenda and attendees are attached.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the workshop was to explore the respective SSR capabilities, programs and policies of the U.S. and UK, identify gaps, and agree steps to ensure better coordination and cooperation in SSR activities between the two governments.

### **Proceedings**

The UK briefed a SSR concept paper (attached), highlighting SSR's definition, objectives, core values, and desired end-state:

Definition: Helping developing and transitional countries manage their security (and justice) functions in a democratically accountable, efficient and effective way by initiating and supporting reform and providing appropriate education and training.

Objectives: 1) Security and access to justice is central to effective and durable development; 2) SSR describes the process for developing professional and effective security structures that will allow citizens to live their lives in safety; and 3) SSR tries to help create well-managed and competent security personnel operating within an effective institutional framework defined by law.

Core Values: 1) People-centered; 2) locally-owned; 3) based on democratic norms and internationally-accepted human rights principles; 4) based on the rule of law; and 5) contributing to an environment characterized by freedom from fear.

Desired End State: An environment in which citizens:

- Live in freedom, peace and safety;
- Participate in process of governance;

- Enjoy the protection of fundamental rights and the rule of law; and
- Have access to (economic) resources and basic necessities of life.

The UK also briefed on the development and current work of the Security Sector Development Advisory Team (SSDAT) and the conflict prevention pools developed to fund activities in Africa and globally from shared, inter-departmental funds. The SSDAT is a multidisciplinary, interagency team with expertise across the various security sectors that deploys to assess, plan for and help implement SSR. The conflict prevention pools are funds established through contributions from the three main departments of state (FCO, DfID and MoD).

The U.S. briefed on the different programs and authorities each relevant department has in the SSR field:

**USAID** discussed the three main practice areas for its involvement (civilian management and oversight, justice and public safety, and peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction). USAID pointed out the restrictions on its interaction with militaries, but the growing ability to work with police forces. USAID described three contract mechanisms (so-called “indefinite quantity contracts”) that can be used to implement SSR programs: Building Recovery and Reform through Democratic Governance (BRDG), Instability, Crisis and Recovery Program (ICRP), and Managing African Conflict (MAC). Each of these contracting mechanisms requires funding, however. Finally, USAID emphasized the decentralized nature of its programs, where local country teams drive the focus.

**State** described the role of peacekeeping operations (PKO) funds and “notwithstanding authority” to allow for expansive engagement with militaries and other security sector institutions. **S/CRS** described its early warning and prevention work, development of a civilian planning framework, the interagency conflict assessment tool, and generic requests for information (RFIs) needed to analyze the security sector.

**Justice** described the major programs it runs in SSR, specifically the International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP) and Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance and Training (OPDAT) program, and the Resident Legal Advisors program. ICITAP and OPDAT both use State Department foreign assistance monies, but have a broad scope of activities in the justice sector. The emphasis is on train-the-trainer and Community Integrated Policing.

**DoD** discussed several programs, including the mil-to-mil contacts under the Warsaw Initiative and Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, and

Joint Forces Command's upcoming exercises and seminars that include rule of law components.

Participants examined two SSR case studies – Sierra Leone and Liberia – to help identify lessons and develop ideas to ensure effective coordination of SSR efforts. General lessons identified include:

- Investing in early, comprehensive analysis is money well spent.
- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), though often important in peace processes, are not the same as SSR.
- SSR is a process that ultimately requires generational change; it is not an event.
- Western governments often have the right tools to address SSR, but proceed haphazardly and do not adequately integrate and coordinate disparate efforts.
- Ensuring local ownership and participation in the process is crucial to success.

### **Major Conclusions**

- The United States Government should develop an overarching policy on SSR that has buy-in from the relevant departments and agencies. The U.S. should also explore establishing a “SSDAT-like” interagency capability to provide comprehensive assessment, planning and advisory support for SSR missions.
- Although a comprehensive and whole-of-government approach is the theoretical ideal, questions of proper sequencing and prioritization of SSR activities were raised and discussed. Each SSR situation will differ, but the U.S. delegation emphasized the need to identify key “must-dos” with appropriate time-frame considerations.
- The UK expressed concern that U.S. focus on post-conflict SSR is too narrow. The U.S. delegation pointed out that post-conflict SSR is a means to focus senior leader attention on the problem and will have benefits for SSR in all situations and environments.
  - Stability Operations, in the emerging U.S. parlance, is no longer seen as a discrete set of tasks confined to the post-conflict phases of conflict, but as integral to the entire spectrum of conflict, including situations where no conflict is anticipated in the near term.
- The concept of pooling departmental resources for SSR should be explored for applicability to the U.S. context.

- The U.S. emphasized the need to provide SSR assessment teams guides or frameworks to facilitate comprehensive security sector analysis. Such guides would ensure all relevant areas and issues are examined, but would not serve as templates or “cookie cutter” means to conduct SSR.

## **Way Ahead**

Participants agreed on a set of activities to move forward, including:

- Developing a reading list on security sector reform. UK pointed to the global facilitation network ([www.gfn-ssr.org](http://www.gfn-ssr.org)) as a starting point.
- Defining objectives for potential peer review of security sector reform efforts (UK lead – scoping paper due January 15, 2006). Peer review could entail experts-level working groups examining SSR efforts in cases where one or the other country took the lead role to identify lessons and propose means to improve performance. Potential case studies could include Haiti, Congo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, and East Timor.
- Sharing performance measures for assessing security sector reform activities. The UK delegation agreed to share their work thus far (by December 15, 2006). Potential follow-on meeting in February 2006 to discuss further development of performance measures.
- Joint Forces Command agreed to insert security sector reform in upcoming exercises and seminars, including venues supporting Unified Action. The PCRU and S/CRS will work with Joint Forces Command to develop an exercise plan that is integrated with the PCRU-S/CRS work-plan.
- Further development of the Security Sector Reform Concept Paper. The U.S. will use the paper as a basis for interagency development of USG policy. (Interagency working group to meet before end of calendar year 2005).
- The UK offered to embed an appropriate U.S. official in the next SSDAT assessment trip to Yemen. JFCOM noted that the Standing Joint Force Headquarters will deploy to the Horn of Africa soon and could potentially offer up their political-military officer (January 2006).
- The UK agreed to facilitate insight into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s SSR processes (January 2006).
- The UK proposed looking at a fragile state scenario for an exercise, as opposed to a post-conflict scenario (lead to Joint Forces Command – initial concept by February 2006).